

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 remain pending in this response with claims 1, 6-8 and 10 being amended and claims 5 and 9 being cancelled by this response. Claims 1, 8 and 10 have been amended to include the features of claims 5 and 9. Further support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and more specifically on page 5, line 28-page 6, line 1. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to be dependent on amended claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added by these amendments.

Specification

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Specifically, the word “audio” is replaced by the word “video” on page 6, line 36 of the specification. No new matter is being added by this amendment.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Eyer (U.S. Patent Publication NO. 2002/0118679 A1).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 5. Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 9. Specifically, these claims have been amended to include the feature of “wherein, when calculating said transmission time periods, the calculated transmission time periods are median filtered in order to obtain a mean transmission time period, and wherein the length of said median filtering is changed dynamically, starting with a pre-defined first number of input transmission time period values and increasing in conformity with the number of further received transmission time period values, up to a pre-defined maximum number of input transmission time period values.” As this feature has been allowed and is included in the amended independent claims, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 8 and 10 are considered patentable. Further, as claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1, these claims are also considered patentable. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to
Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Steinborn et al.

By: 

Jack Schwartz

Reg. No. 34,721

Tel. No. (212) 971-0416

Thomson Licensing, LLC.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
November 16, 2009